

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TYLER DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA §
v. § Case No. 4:22-cr -110-JDK
ERIC REED MARASCIO (6) and §
CORD DEAN NEWMAN (8) §

ORDER ON PRO SE MOTIONS

Before the Court are several pro se filings by Defendant Eric Reed Marascio. Docket Nos. 849; 850; 851; 852; 853; 854; 855.

The Court will not consider Defendant's pro se motions while Defendant is represented by counsel. Because he is currently represented by counsel, Defendant is not entitled to hybrid representation; that is, Defendant may not also represent himself. *See Neal v. Texas*, 870 F.2d 312, 315–16 (5th Cir. 1989) (explaining that a "criminal defendant does not have the right . . . to a 'hybrid representation,' partly by counsel and partly by himself" (quoting *United States v. Daniels*, 572 F.2d 535, 540 (5th Cir. 1978))). Thus, these motions are "unauthorized," and the Court may properly disregard them. *United States v. Lopez*, 313 F. App'x 730, 731 (5th Cir. 2009); *see also United States v. Jones*, 842 F. App'x 878, 883 (5th Cir. 2021) (affirming district court's striking of represented defendant's pro se motion to withdraw guilty plea).

Accordingly, the Court **STRIKES** Defendant Marascio's pro se motions (Docket Nos. 849; 850; 851; 852; 853; 854; 855).

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 4th day of February, 2025.



JEREMY D. KERNODLE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE